


REMARKS

Below is a diagram illustrating the relationship among the pending claims 1-7, 10-26, 29-36, 38, 52-62, 64-77, 82-85 and 87. Claims 8, 9, 27, 28, 37, 39-51, 63, 78-81 and 86 have been previously canceled. Remaining claims 1-7, 10-26, 29-36, 38, 52-62, 64-77, 82-85 and 87 have been previously presented for examination. In this response to the Office action mailed November 15, 2007, claims 1, 59, 64 and 68 have been amended as explained hereinafter. The amended claims are shaded in the diagram.



Paragraphs 3 and 4 - Rejection of claims 64-72 under Section 112, first paragraph

Claims 64-72 are rejected for claiming the invention as a process for making a body for holding material without requiring the body to be for a vehicle. According to the Office action, the specification enables making a body for a vehicle but not bodies per se and, therefore, the claims are not fully supported by the specification. Applicant disagrees. One of ordinary skill in the art would immediately appreciate from applicant's specification that the body need not be part of a mobile machine. Nevertheless, instead of providing evidence that the specification fully supports the claim without reference to a vehicle, applicant has elected to amend independent claims 64 and 68 to state the body is for use with a vehicle in order to address the concerns of the Office action.

Paragraphs 5 and 6 - Rejection of claims 59 and 64-67 under Section 112, first paragraph

Claims 59 and 64-67 are rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, because of lack of antecedent basis for terminology in the claims. In this amendment, claim 59 has been amended to introduce the phrase "lowest practical vertical location" in claim 59 and delete the phrase "the container" in claim 64. These amendments should overcome the rejections.

Paragraph 7 - Recommendation to amend claim 1

Applicant appreciates the suggestion for amending claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended as recommended herein.

Paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 - Provisional double patenting rejection of claims 52, 57 and 59

To overcome the provisional double patenting rejection of claims 52, 57 and 59, applicant is filing with this amendment a terminal disclaimer against applicant's co-pending application no. 09/593,647.

Status of Related Applications


This application is the parent of a continuation-in-part U.S. patent application no. 09/593,647. The '647 application is on the docket of examiner Dwin Craig of Art Unit 2123. As of the date of this amendment, a notice of allowance has been entered into the application. The issue fee has not yet been paid.

This application is also related to U.S. patent application no. 10/286,095, although there is no formal relationship under 35 U.S.C. § 120. The application matured into U.S. Patent No. 7,257,467 on August 14. A continuation has been filed and has been assigned serial number 11/838,079. Applicant intends to either file a preliminary amendment to the claims in this application or abandon it in favor of a continuation-in-part application.

CONCLUSION

The amendments in this response address all of the rejections of the claims in the Office action mailed November 15, 2007. The application is in good and proper form for allowance, and the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John B. Conklin", is written over a horizontal line.

John B. Conklin, Reg. No. 30,369
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 6, 2007